



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,421

03/25/2004

Henderikus H.N.J. Jorg

ASMINT.066AUS

8929

20995

7590

06/26/2006

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

FOX, JOHN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3753

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/810,421	Applicant(s) JORG, HENDERIKUS H.N.J.	
	Examiner John Fox	Art Unit 3753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15, 16, 18-25 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15, 16, 18-25 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claims 14, 17, and 26-42 have been cancelled.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardee in view of Van Bragt.

Hardee shows a multiway rotary valve which uses bearings 5 to position the rotor .00075 inches (.019 mm) from the stator to reduce the torque needed to rotate the valve. The Hardee valve is read as forming a seal in that excessive gas leakage is prevented, see column 3, lines 29-35. Hardee does not use glass, and shows a different flow pattern than claimed. Van Bragt teaches a multiway rotary valve with a flow pattern as claimed and uses glass for the rotor and stator for use in a laboratory. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have provided the valve of Hardee with such a flow pattern as taught by Van Bragt and to use glass for the rotor and stator to use the Hardee valve in a laboratory. The use of a groove such as shown by Hardee to form a fluid passage is considered to be an obvious step. The use of quartz glass is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice in view of the well known nature of quartz glass. The recitation of exhaust merely relates to intended use and is given no weight.

Claim 15 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardee in view of Van Bragt as applied above and further in view of Tidwell.

Hardee, as modified, shows the claimed device except for the bearing material. Tidwell teaches an improvement to roller bearings including Teflon and Turcite. It would

Art Unit: 3753

have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have used such a Teflon or Turcite bearing in the valve of Hardee, as modified, to improve the bearings thereof.

Claims 16, 18-19, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardee in view of Huska, of record.

Hardee shows the claimed device except for the flow pattern. Huska shows a multiway rotary valve with the claimed flow path. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have configured the Hardee valve with the flow path shown by Huska to similarly control fluid flow as Huska does.

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardee in view of Huska as applied above and further in view of Van Bragt.

Hardee, as modified, teaches the claimed device except for the use of glass. Van Bragt teaches a multiway rotary valve that uses glass for the rotor and stator for use in a laboratory. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have used glass to make the valve of Hardee, as modified, to desirably allow the use of the valve in a laboratory.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Patent Hoteling Program.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Keasel can be reached on 571-272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753